

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

GREGORY BEVERSDORFF,

§

Petitioner,

§

v.

1:23-CV-1121-DII

BURNET COUNTY OFFICIALS DEF,
THE STATE OF TEXAS, and GRANITE
SHOALS OFFICIALS,

§

Respondents.

§

ORDER

Before the Court is Petitioner Gergory Beversdorff's ("Petitioner") Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, (Dkt. 1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mark Lane for findings and recommendations, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Judge Lane filed his report and recommendation on February 7, 2024. (Dkt. 24). In his report and recommendation, Judge Lane recommends that the Court dismiss Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus for want of jurisdiction premised on failure to exhaust and the *Younger* abstention doctrine. (*Id.* at 2–3). Petitioner received the report and recommendation no later than February 12, 2024. (Dkt. 26). As of the date of this order, Petitioner has not filed any objections to the report and recommendation.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), a party may serve and file specific, written objections to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation and, in doing so, secure de novo review by the district court. When no objections are timely filed, a district court can review the magistrate's report and recommendation for clear error. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note ("When no

timely objection is filed, the [district] court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

Because no party has filed timely objections, the Court reviews the report and recommendation for clear error. Having done so and finding no clear error, the Court accepts and adopts the report and recommendation as its own order.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, (Dkt. 24), is **ADOPTED. IT IS ORDERED** that Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, (Dkt. 1), is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for want of jurisdiction premised on failure to exhaust and the *Younger* abstention doctrine.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

SIGNED on March 4, 2024.



ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE